

Remarks

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

The indication of the allowability of some of the claims in the present application is acknowledged with appreciation.

The rejection of claims 1, 3-5, 10, 13, 15, 18, 21, 22 and 25 under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over Greenberg et al. (US 6,104,558) in view of Lupstan et al. (20040148558) is respectfully traversed.

For the sake of this discussion only, these two references are assumed to show all the elements of claims 1, 15 and 25.

First, the Office Action contends that "it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to modify Greenberg et al. with the above teachings of Lapstun et al., the motivation being to provide a method for determining offset with respect to a sequence." This contention is incorrect.

Lapstun et al. is directed to error correction and detection. To that end, determining the position of an error (detection) is required before that error can be corrected. So despite the fact that Lapstun et al. use words like "offset" and "position," these have nothing to do with the claim features of claims 1, 15 and 25. That alone shows that one skilled in the art would not be motivated to combine these references, contrary to what the Office Action contends.

Second, error detection and correction requires the use of many bits. However, the use of many bits for purposes of servo position information as taught in Greenberg et al. is not desirable as recognized by one skilled in the art. Evidence of this recognition is clearly taught in Greenberg et al. at col. 2, lines 42-52:

One problem associated with both theses schemes is that the identifier, also referred to as a servo address, occupies storage area that would otherwise be available for recording data. This becomes especially troublesome as the track densities increase and disk sizes decrease. As track densities increase, larger track numbers, which require larger field widths on the disk, are required to uniquely identify each track. Smaller disks place a premium on disk space available for data. What is needed is a verification method which reduces the amount of disk space required to store the servo address.

So Greenberg et al. teach away from applying the scheme taught in Lapstun et al. since such a scheme requires many bits. This alone shows that one skilled in the art would not be motivated to combine these references despite what the Office Action contends.

Furthermore, Lapstun et al. is not analogous art. That reference deals with error detection and correction, which is neither in the same field of endeavor of the present invention as claimed nor is reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the inventor is involved. For this reason alone, this rejection cannot stand because Lapstun et al. cannot be used as prior art against claims 1, 15 and 25.

In view of the discussions above, claims 1, 15 and 25 are not obvious over the applied references and are therefore allowable. Claims 3-5, 10, 13, 15, 18, 21 and 22 are also allowable due to their respective dependence on allowable claims 1 and 15.

Conclusion

This Reply is believed to be responsive to all points raised in the Office Action. Accordingly, prompt allowance and passage of the application to issue are earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner have any remaining questions or concerns, he/she is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone to expeditiously resolve such concerns.

Respectfully submitted,

Seagate Technology LLC
(Assignee of the Entire Interest)

3/6/06
Date

David K. Lucente
David K. Lucente, Reg. No. 36,202
Seagate Technology LLC
Intellectual Property Dept. – COL2LGL
389 Disc Drive
Longmont, CO 80503
(720) 684-2295 (telephone)
(720) 684-2588 (facsimile)